

unclear due to the fragmentary state of the evidence. Thus, her proposal ‘essa va con buona probabilità ricondotta ad una forma di tassazione in moneta dall’ammontare non variabile e non direttamente applicate ai terreni ma alle persone, basata sul rapporto tra la terra e chi la coltivava’ (in ‘Conclusioni’, p. 113) is all that might be said without scholarly conjecture.

The terminology’s longevity throughout the imperial period is visible in the juridical and gromatic (Pseudo-Agennius Urbicus) writings, where it is applied to categories of land instead of referring to persons’ or communities’ status (§§4–5). Especially important is Gai. *Inst.* 2.14a, 21, wherein, under the category *res nec mancipi*, we find the distinction between *praedia provincilia stipendiaria*, located in provinces that are considered (*intelleguntur*) those of the *populus Romanus*, and *praedia provincilia tributaria* in provinces that are believed (*creduntur!*) to belong to the Roman emperor (cf. §4.1). This can be explained by the different status of ‘senatorial’ provinces, being already ‘pacified’ and thus subject to regular tax-allocations, i.e. *stipendium*, and ‘imperial’ provinces still bound to necessary ‘immediate’ war-funding taxes, i.e. regularly assessed *tributa* on the heads or soil of the provincials living there (see Kritzinger, op. cit., pp. 120–1). Hence, this juristic distinction should be merely seen as an ideal administrative scheme, especially in regard to the different treasuries (*aerarium populi Romani vs imperialis fiscus*) into which the respective taxes flowed, and not be mixed with ‘historical’ records (see the discussion on Pliny the Elder’s accounts of *populi* and *oppida* in imperial provinces as *stipendiarii*, S., pp. 84–6, cf. §2.1.1); thus, late antique legal sources could also merge both categories (e.g. *Frg. Vat.* 61: *in fundo stipendiario vel tributario* ≈ Ulp. *Dig.* 7.4.1pr: *in fundo vectigali*; see p. 88), and we find similar approximations in gromatic writings (p. 103).

The concise summary is accompanied by a useful table classifying the attestations of *stipendiarius* in different categories (soldiers, persons, person-based communities, land, figurative uses etc.) while the bibliography is testament to the vast literature devoted to this subject. This is a useful reference work for approaching tax terminology, albeit the exact usage in any given case will still remain subject to a careful analysis of the immediate context and intention, especially in literary sources that need not be linked to the legal-administrative system underlying the tax discourse.

Institute for the History of Ancient Civilizations, Changchun

SVEN GÜNTHER
sveneca@aol.com

THE CONCEPT OF *AUCTORITAS* AT ROME

DAVID (J.-M.), HURLET (F.) (edd.) *L’auctoritas à Rome. Une notion constitutive de la culture politique. Actes du colloque de Nanterre (10–12 septembre 2018)*. (Scripta Antiqua 136.) Pp. 422, figs.

Bordeaux: Ausonius, 2020. Paper, €25. ISBN: 978-2-35613-353-3.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X2100216X

Many Latin terms related to the exercise of power (*dignitas, potestas, imperium, libertas, maiestas, mos* ...) have, even recently, been the subject of important research. But a systematic and exhaustive study of *auctoritas* had never before been conducted. The 444 titles mentioned under the heading *auctoritas* in O. Hiltbrunner’s *Bibliographie zur*

lateinischen Wortforschung (1988) should not mislead: the only study of some depth on the meaning of *audivitas* in the political sphere was the comprehensive but dated one by J. Hellegouarc'h (*Le vocabulaire latin* [1963], pp. 295–320). The gap has been filled by an international conference held in September 2018 at the University of Nanterre, the presentations from which are published in this valuable volume.

L'audivitas à Rome includes a broad introduction ('Quand la vertu s'incarne'), eighteen chapters split into five sections ('Terminologie, définitions et contexte'; 'Les instances religieuses et politiques de l'*audivitas*'; 'L'*audivitas* dans l'action'; 'L'*audivitas* dans le droit'; 'Vers l'*audivitas* impériale') and a brief conclusion ('Nature, fonctions et effets de l'*audivitas* dans la culture civique romaine à la fin de la République et au début de l'Empire'). It is not intended as another addition to the studies on *Begriffsgeschichte*, but has a much more ambitious goal, already alluded to in its subtitle. On the one hand, the mention of the concept of 'political culture' reveals the intention to include this volume in the rich line of investigations that in the last 20 years (cf. K.-J. Hölkeskamp, *Rekonstruktionen einer Republik* [2004]) have expanded the field of studies on Roman politics, 'en y intégrant les rituels, les images et l'ensemble des actes performatifs à travers lesquels des négociations étaient menées' (editors' introduction, p. 8). On the other hand, *audivitas* is considered a *constitutive notion*, 'l'élément central de la culture politique romaine, celui qui était au cœur des interactions sociales essentielles à l'exercice du pouvoir et à sa représentation' (p. 9); furthermore, 'comme l'air qu'on respire, l'*audivitas* était pour les Romains une réalité si évidente qu'ils ne se donnaient pas la peine de la définir' (ibid.).

Indeed, a quick look at the *audivitas* lemma in the *TLL* confirms this 'universal' use of the concept, which is reflected in the various chapters of this volume. In addition to the strictly political sphere, *audivitas* comes into play in the activities of jurists (D. Mantovani; A. Schiavone), of erudites (P. Le Doze), of priests (Y. Berthelet; F. Van Haepelen) – and in every age since the early republic (T. Lanfranchi, on the XII Tables; K.-J. Hölkeskamp, on the laws *Publilia* and *Maenia de patrum audivitate*).

This wide diffusion of the concept explains why the Romans (even speakers of the Greek language: see É. Famerie) 'did not concern themselves with defining it'. The theme emerges above all in the study by F. Pina Polo on the use of *audivitas* in Livy, Books 31–45. Pina Polo notes that *audivitas* is a polysemic term, which can mean 'influence', but also 'credibility', 'prestige' and 'authority' as well as 'authorisation' and 'approval'. This polysemy has a specific reason, namely that *audivitas* applies to both groups and individuals, and it is used by Livy in three different contexts: he speaks of *audivitas patrum* or *senatus* in relation to the senate; he applies the term to foreign individuals and peoples; and much more rarely he refers *audivitas* to Roman individuals (Scipio Africanus, Cato, Aemilius Paulus). Perhaps, I would say, for Livy the 'precursors' of the *audivitas Augusti* had to be few and carefully chosen (starting with Evander, who *audivitatem magis quam imperio regebat loca*, Liv. 1.7.8: see now E. Bianchi, *JUS* 3 [2018]).

If this widespread diffusion of the term and its polyvalent application justify the comparison with 'the air we breathe', they could also lead to an excessive fragmentation of the material in the volume presented here. The risk is averted thanks above all to the excellent introduction (which is not a mere framing of the topic, but an original synthesis) and to the contribution of M. Jehne, who opens the fifth section ('Vers l'*audivitas* impériale') and best clarifies the complexity of *audivitas*. Jehne rightly points out that *audivitas* 'vor allem eine Zuschreibung ist' (p. 326): an *ascription* by those who accept that the advice or orders of certain individuals and groups are substantial, and as a consequence, they are often willing to follow. It is an essential point that *audivitas* always

depends on an external recognition to whoever holds it (as Pina Polo also writes, p. 155: ‘*auctoritas* parece haber sido en Roma ante todo un concepto mental y un término social’), it is not acquired forever (at least until Augustus), and it can increase or decrease. Moreover, *auctoritas* may be ‘individual’ (e.g. an experienced senator) or ‘collective’ (the senate as a council): individual *auctoritas* is subdivided into an institutional branch (a consul’s authority) and a personal one (perceptible in the difference in *auctoritas* between colleagues); collective *auctoritas* may be cumulative (the authority of the group is understood as the summation of the individual authority of the members: e.g. the senate) or integral (e.g. the *populus Romanus*).

As is to be expected, most of the chapters deal with the multiple aspects of individual *auctoritas* (on which the definition proposed by David, p. 189, is based). Collective *auctoritas* is the subject of two particularly interesting chapters. The chapter by Hölkeskamp on the laws *de patrum auctoritate* is very useful as it clarifies the importance of *auctoritas* in the context of concrete political practice. According to Hölkeskamp the laws *Publilia* and *Maenia*, which regulated the *auctoritas patrum* by integrating it into the decision-making processes in the senate, contributed to the consolidation of the senate as a stable institution. This in turn was an essential prerequisite of the formalisation of decision-making processes in the senate in the shape of *auctoritas senatus*.

The chapter by G. Zecchini investigates the meaning of *auctoritas populi* in Cicero (*Manil.* 63–4) and of *auctoritas Italiae* in Cicero (*Sest.* 35) and Caesar (*B civ.* 1.35.1): both these formulas are alternative and polemic in relation to the *auctoritas senatus* and the *potestas* of the consuls and praetors, which Sulla had enhanced (here Zecchini convincingly illustrates the relationship of ‘inverse proportionality’ between *auctoritas* and *potestas*: for a different approach to the problem see David, p. 190). Italy (i.e. Roman citizens having the right to vote) becomes a politically active subject, whose *auctoritas* can legitimate Caesar’s acts and deeds. Zecchini concludes with a fascinating hypothesis on the real intentions of Caesar before the Ides of March. The recent publication of the *Fasti Privernates* (F. Zevi, *ZPE* 197 [2016]) has suggested that Caesar’s perpetual dictatorship has to be understood not as ‘everlasting’, but as ‘undetermined’. According to Zecchini Caesar probably purposed to give it up after his return from the Parthian campaign and to replace it with his own *auctoritas*: the *auctoritas senatus* would have been replaced by the *auctoritas Italiae* and the *auctoritas Caesaris*.

This conclusion refers us back to the well-known passage of the *Res Gestae*, which emphasises the superiority of Augustus’ *auctoritas* (34.3: *a]uctoritate [omnibus praestiti, potest]atis au[tem n]ihilo ampliu[s habu]i quam cet[eri qui m]ihi quoque in ma[gis]tra[t]u conlegae f]uerunt*). This passage is the most quoted in the volume – which is not surprising. Since taking the name (etymologically connected to *actor/augeo*), Augustus’ was the first (successful) attempt to ‘absolutize’ the concept of *auctoritas*, by binding it to himself in all circumstances and in front of anyone. It is precisely from the *Res Gestae* that the final chapter by Hurler takes its cue. This chapter looks at the transition from *auctoritas senatus* to *auctoritas principis*, the foundation of imperial power, which is part of a debate recently renewed by the contrasting contributions of G. Rowe (*JRS* 103 [2013]) and K. Galinsky (*Hermes* 143 [2015]). It aims to describe how the *auctoritas* of Augustus emerged and overshadowed that of the senate, by analysing not only the aforementioned passage, but also the other three epigraphic documents from the Augustan period that contain the formula *auctoritate / ex auctoritate Augusti*. For Hurler the *auctoritas principis*, far from being an established institution from the beginning, gradually developed through interactions with the senate: the *auctoritas Augusti* needed the recognition of the senators to produce its effects. Only from Claudius onwards the formula *ex auctoritate senatus* disappeared almost completely, while *ex auctoritate*

Augusti was generalised. This opens a research path (the evolution of the concept of *auctoritas* in the post-Augustan age), which the volume approaches only in the fourth section ('L'*auctoritas* dans le droit') and which would be worthy of further study.

If *RGDA* 34.3 is the most cited passage in the volume, the most cited author by far is Cicero. Again, this is not surprising, given that '*auctoritas* was ... one of Cicero's favourite concepts' (J.P.V.D. Balsdon, *CQ* 10 [1960]). Cicero is almost omnipresent: an entire section of the volume is dedicated to him ('L'*auctoritas* dans l'action'); the chapter by C. Bur on *auctoritas* and *mos maiorum* and the chapter by Berthelet are largely based on him. This observation is not meant to be a criticism: it cannot be denied that the Ciceronian corpus constitutes a precious and often irreplaceable source for the definition of the concept of *auctoritas* (and we must work with the sources we have at our disposal). But if Cicero's preponderance appears inevitable, it can be partly misleading: we risk attributing to *the Romans* the point of view of *Cicero*, a politician and master of the forum who is not known for his objectivity or his coherence (it is enough to recall the way in which he first values, then sets aside the notion of *auctoritas populi* and the one that he had 'invented', *auctoritas Italiae*). This is all the more true when Cicero himself becomes the object of research, as in the interesting chapter by É. Deniaux on Cicero's *auctoritas*. The idea that during the first months of 43 'son expérience et son *auctoritas* lui [avaient] donné une supériorité évidente devant le Sénat et devant le peuple', that he 'avait pris la charge entière de l'État à Rome' (p. 247), has perhaps more to do with Cicero's self-representation (*Fam.* 12.24.2, quoted *ibid.*) or with the flattery of some of his interlocutors (such as Brutus: cf. *Cic. Brut.* 1.4a.2) than with the reality of the facts.

L'auctoritas à Rome is an excellent volume, which considerably adds to our knowledge of a fundamental aspect or rather a 'constitutive notion' of Roman political culture.

Milano

GIANPAOLO URSO
gp.urso@gmail.com

MASS VIOLENCE IN ROMAN WARFARE

BAKER (G.) *Spare No One. Mass Violence in Roman Warfare*. Pp. x + 281, ills, maps. Lanham, Boulder, New York and London: Rowman and Littlefield, 2021. Cased, £68, US\$89. ISBN: 978-1-5381-1220-5.
 doi:10.1017/S0009840X21002225

B.'s book is the revised version of his Ph.D., defended in 2016. It addresses violence in Roman warfare, a theme that has been a growing interest of scholars since the 1990s, but, as B. rightly states, for which no extensive survey has been produced since then in English. In order to do so, B. mainly adopts a 'strategical' or 'instrumental' approach, leaning on a theoretical framework borrowed from political science and the sociology of violence, and which has more recently been adapted to history (J. Sémelin, *Purifier et détruire* [2005]) and even sparsely to ancient history (cf. the non-exhaustive list on p. 13). This background gives a solid basis for the volume, and the author of this review can only subscribe to this fecund approach. B. develops a deep exposition on the subject by focusing on a precise concept: that of mass violence. It provides a clear question to explore the features of Roman republican warfare: how and why the Romans employed mass